DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 291 250 FL 017 178

AUTHOR Hayes, A. S.; And Others
TITLE The Evaluation of Foreign Language Teaching.
INSTITUTION Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Apr 67
NOTE 55p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Classroom Techniques; *Course Organization; Curriculum Evaluation; *Evaluation Criteria; Evaluation Methods; *Instructional Effectiveness; Program Administration; *Program Effectiveness; *Second Language Instruction; *Teacher Evaluation; Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

The development of a plan for language teaching evaluation and the first steps taken to implement it are reported. The plan, developed as a result of efforts to assist the Defense Language Institute in program evaluation, involves direct observation of language instruction in progress. Outside observers would assess the degree to which course design, program administration, and individual teaching performance conform to certain principles, policies, and procedures that have been demonstrated to play a role in successful language learning. The final evaluation would also draw on the observations of the students in class and the teachers themselves to the extent that those observations would also have been demonstrated to be relevant. The report outlines the formal steps of the evaluation plan and provides a more detailed discussion of the ways in which it extends standard evaluation procedures. Results of initial implementation at the 1965 National Defense Education Act (NDEA) Summer Institute for Teachers in Foreign Languages are also presented and discussed. Rating instructions and tabulated ratings are appended. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

CENTER FOR APPLIED LINGUISTICS, 1717 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036

ED291250

THE EVALUATION OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING

by

A. S. Hayes
Center for Applied Linguistics

and

W. E. Lambert and G. R. Tucker
McGill University

April 1967

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

GRT

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FL017178

Recent efforts at the Center for Applied Linguistics to assist the Defense Language Institute in evaluating certain of its programs and courses have led to a collaborative project with McGill University. This document is the first formal report emanating from that collaboration.

THE EVALUATION OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING

A. S. Hayes
Center for Applied Linguistics

and

W. E. Lambert and G. R. Tucker
McGill University

Remarkable changes have taken place in foreign language teaching and learning in recent years.[1] On all levels of instruction understanding and speaking have become serious primary goals, as highly valued as literacy in the language. Many teachers now regard them as prerequisite to literacy and to the ultimate study of literature. This change in objectives is reflected in the now familiar contrast between an "audio-lingual" approach, stereotyped as involving mimicry, memorization and pattern practice, and a traditional approach, stereotyped as "grammar-translation." There have been both formal and informal evaluations[2] of these and other "methods,"[3] but conclusions about them have been limited in their generality because insufficient attention has been given to the wide variety of classroom and laboratory procedures actually used by teachers supposedly adhering to one method or another. Presumably,

---

1. From the enormous literature, the following offer recent statements and critiques of the status quo:

   Carroll, John B. "The contributions of psychological theory and educational research to the teaching of foreign languages." Modern Language Journal, XLIX, 5, May, 1965. pp. 273-81.

   Hayes, Alfred S. "New directions in foreign language teaching." Modern Language Journal, XLIX, 5, May, 1965. pp. 281-93.

   Locke, William N. "The future of language laboratories." Modern Language Journal, XLIX, 5, May, 1965. pp. 294-304.

   Valdman, Albert, ed. Trends in Language Teaching. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1966.

2. A recent comprehensive study at the college level is George A. C. Scherer and Michael Wertheimer, A Psycholinguistic Experiment in Foreign-Language Teaching, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964.

3. For a discussion of the elements that comprise method, see, in a different context, Hayes, Alfred S., ed. Recommendations of the Work Conference on Literacy, held for the Agency for International Development, United States Department of State, at Airlie House, Warrenton, Virginia, May 23-28, 1964. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1965, esp. pp. 35-37.

the different classroom and laboratory procedures that differentiate methods reflect overt or covert adherence to different principles and different policies. Yet, little attention has been given to means of systematically identifying and evaluating either the procedures, or the principles and policies underlying them. This neglect of evaluation is due in large part, we believe, to the time-consuming and exacting requirements of the standard techniques used in education and psychology for evaluating procedural differences of these sorts.

Standard techniques call for careful comparisons of the post-training proficiency of groups of learners, who are measured and found to be equivalent in potential at the start of their training, and who then receive essentially different types of training. Note that by obtaining objective measures of pre- to post-training changes in language proficiency, the technique, as typically used, often neglects highly relevant events that take place during the actual training program. Consequently one may wonder whether some other techniques could be developed that would have the merits of the standard approach, but that would be based more on what the students and teachers do in the language classroom and in the language laboratory. Such techniques, if they could be developed, would be extremely useful to a) those who are experimenting with newer teaching methods, b) those contemplating revisions of existing procedures, and c) those involved in evaluating ongoing programs of language training.

Recent efforts at the Center for Applied Linguistics to assist the Defense Language Institute in evaluating certain of its programs and courses led to the present collaborative venture with McGill University. This report, emanating from that collaboration, discusses the development of a plan for language teaching evaluation based on direct observation of actual training in progress, and presents the results of first steps taken to implement it. Stated briefly, outside observers would assess the degree to which course design, program administration, and individual teaching performance conform to certain principles, policies, and procedures that will have been <u>demonstrated</u> to play a role in successful language learning. The final evaluation of the training program would also draw on the observations of the <u>students</u> in the class, and the <u>teachers</u> themselves, to the extent that such observations will also have been <u>demonstrated</u> to be relevant. Clearly, the key phrase here is <u>demonstrated</u>, for demonstration is essential if the relative merits of ways

of teaching foreign languages are ever to be determined by means more objective than personal conviction, however widespread and however sincere. It will be necessary to show in some detail how this is possible.

Here are the formal steps in our plan to arrive at valid evaluation by direct observation. Henceforth we shall use the term feature(s) to refer to one or more policies, principles or procedures viewed independently; we shall use the term teaching profile or simply profile to refer to a particular array of policies, principles and procedures (features) as they might be found in a given instructional setting, say in a university or high school foreign language department. Any recurrent profile may have become established as a "method" of language teaching with a distinctive name, i.e. St. Cloud, audio-lingual, audio-visual, direct, television, traditional, and others. We also use the term subprofile to refer to recurrent variations in detail as they might be found in different classes in the same instructional setting.

1. The assembly and preliminary reduction of a comprehensive inventory of features believed to be important in foreign language teaching. The subject matter covered by the inventory (see Table 2, page 17) includes administration and policy, teachers and teacher competence, course design including materials, classroom procedures and language laboratory practices. Step 1 has been completed, and the results are presented in this paper beginning on page 10 .

2. Pretesting (matching) of a large number of prospective language students at different universities or schools.

3. a) Direct observation by outside evaluators of different classes in progress at these institutions. The discussion below suggests 12 classes from nine institutions, or 108 classes of approximately 25 students per class. The purpose, at this stage, is to yield descriptions of teaching profiles based on the inventory produced in step 1. b) Judgments of both students and their teachers will be collected.

4. Posttesting of these classes. Application of statistical procedures to evaluate the relative importance of different profiles or subprofiles. Separate analysis and evaluation of student and teacher judgments.

5. Pretesting of other language classes.

6. Evaluation of these classes in progress according to weighted judgments based on adherence to principles demonstrated in step 4, as modified by student and teacher judgments to the extent proved relevant in step 4.

7. Posttesting of achievement in these classes and comparison with evaluations made in step 6.

If evaluation via step 6 proves to be as effective as the pretest-posttest sequence, it now becomes a streamlined procedure of great utility when used as the sole evaluative instrument. Steps 2-4 inclusive remain always available as protection against closing off language instruction from further investigation. They are invoked whenever newer insights and new research inspire variations in profiles deemed to have reasonable potential for modifying the observational criteria as used typically in step 5. Since the possibility of continuing to improve language instruction rests heavily upon such new research and new insights, the authors feel that teachers and administrators must come to have a more than casual understanding of the difficult problems attending evaluation. In the hope of contributing to increased understanding of these problems, we now present a more detailed discussion of our research plan, which extends the typical standard evaluation procedure in a number of interesting and, it is hoped, fruitful directions.

1. The development of an inventory. Suppose that we are permitted to study, for research purposes, a large number of foreign language classes at various centers across the nation, say twelve Spanish (or any other language) classes from nine university settings, making a total of 108 classes with 25 students per class. The nine settings will be chosen because they are believed to have programs with distinctively different profiles. The profile of one setting could be one which many teachers would identify with a "pure" or extreme audio-lingual approach; the profile of another might readily be identified with a variation of a more traditional approach, that of a third setting with an eclectic or compromise approach. The selected programs of the other institutions would represent still other variations. We have suggested including a number of different classes from each setting, in order to assure that sufficient consideration would be given to within-setting variations that reflect each

teacher's individual style. In order to be able to describe the features that identify each profile, it would be extremely useful to have a master list or comprehensive inventory of such features. The approach we have followed is to ask experienced teachers to suggest features they believe to be important in developing second-language proficiency. There is no hint here of evaluation by consensus, for these hunches about what works in language training and what doesn't are to be regarded only as potentially valuable insights, subject to careful validation in step 4. Our primary purpose at this stage is to produce a descriptive rather than an evaluative instrument, however, for in step 3 we shall have to be as specific as possible in identifying and describing different teaching profiles, or at least much more specific than has been customary. Our unreduced inventory of features contained 324 items, and is by no means necessarily exhaustive.

2. Pretesting (see Table 1). Our research plan requires, as is customary, that the groups of students in the various classes within and among settings be systematically matched, at the start of the training to be evaluated, in characteristics that are known or presumed to be relevant to eventual language proficiency. Important characteristics are language learning aptitude, verbal intelligence, kind and degree of motivation, and attitude toward the group whose language is to be learned. If each of these characteristics is measured by one or more objective tests, a composite score based on some optimum combination of the scores on such tests would constitute a measure of what we could call language learning "potential." The greater power of such a composite measure stems largely from the inclusion of motivational and attitudinal considerations, often neglected. If no matching procedures are used, of course, we will not be able to determine later if differences in language proficiency at the end of the training program are due to differences in teaching profiles or simply to individual differences in language learning potential.

As shown in Table 1, this experimental design readily covers the assessment of students in intermediate as well as introductory classes, the former being tested for both potential and achievement at the start of training. Advanced classes concerned almost entirely with literary studies would not be included.

Table 1 about here

Table 1

Outline of Proposed Testing Phases*

Language Setting #1, Profile #1

Initial Testing
Steps 2 and 5

Post-Testing
Steps 4 and 7

Introductory Classes

	Low P	Average P	High P	Low A	Average A	High A
Class 1= Subprofile 1	{list of scores}	{list of scores}	{list of scores}	{list of scores}	{list of scores}	{list of scores}
Class 2= Subprofile 2	"	"	"	"	"	"
Class 3= Subprofile 3 etc.	"	"	"	"	"	"

Intermediate Classes

	Low P	Average P	High P	Low A	Average A	High A
Class 1= Subprofile 1	{list of scores}	{list of scores}	{list of scores}	{list of scores}	{list of scores}	{list of scores}
	Low A	Average A	High A			
	{list of scores}	{list of scores}	{list of scores}			
Class 2= Subprofile 2 etc.	{list of P and A scores}	{list of P and A scores}	{list of P and A scores}	"	"	"

*See text for crucial role of direct observation of training and of student and teacher judgments.

Definitions:

Setting : University or school where training is to be evaluated. Nine are proposed.

Profile : A recurrent array of instructional and administrative policies, principles and procedures. The number of distinctive profiles to be found in the nine settings will be established by direct observation in step 3.

Subprofile: Profile with some variations in detail as observed typically in different classes in the same setting. Twelve classes are suggested of about 25 students each.

P : Language learning potential, based on measurements of aptitude, verbal intelligence, kind and degree of motivation, and attitude toward group whose language is to be learned.

A : Achievement in understanding, speaking, reading and writing.

3. Direct observation of training. a) Preliminary discussions with department heads at interested universities would produce broadly general descriptions of goals and methods; interviews with some teachers would yield further specifics on classroom and laboratory procedures. The choice of textbook or other published or locally prepared instructional materials would provide further important clues to the selection of settings whose language programs promised sufficient contrast to make evaluation worthwhile. From this point on, there are problems which only direct observation of training can begin to solve. Supervision of language classroom instruction varies greatly from institution to institution, and does not exist in many colleges and universities. The long tradition that the university classroom is sacrosanct, that it is really ungentlemanly to peek, combines with the practice of placing much introductory language teaching in the hands of inexperienced assistants to produce a tremendous disparity in the teaching practices that teachers actually engage in, irrespective of any methodological label. All this is intended not as criticism, but to explain why it is imperative that we now use the instrument developed in step 1 to help us describe what actually happens. If we do not do this, we have condemned the statistical analyses of step 4 to a comparison of the methodological labels on the classroom doors, and these labels cannot identify what goes on behind those doors with either sufficient precision or sufficient consistency for our purposes.

In practice, at step 3, outside evaluators would be given in schedule form the descriptive inventory previously developed. This is a set of <u>potentially</u> important features whose relevance has yet to be demonstrated. The evaluators (i.e. describers, at this first level of investigation) visit enough classes at different times during the training program (how many and at what times may well be the subject of a preliminary feasibility study) and produce a profile description in inventory terms. Provision must be made for including descriptions of practices which have not been anticipated by the inventory. A full profile description, of course, contains many features besides teaching practices.

b) To suggest including the judgments of <u>students</u> and their <u>teachers</u> in the streamlined evaluation procedure of step 6, is surely to invite controversy. But students are always there, they are the ones learning, they can be asked to

give their views about the strengths and weaknesses of the program at various times during the course. The technical language of the schedules used by the describers would need to be modified for this purpose, of course. Student evaluations should be considered in the light of their own language potential as previously measured (i.e. high, average, low) and according to their own proficiency standing in the course (A, B, C, D grade). One might eventually give different weights to the judgments of those who are getting poor grades, for example. In much the same spirit, the course teachers themselves could be asked to judge their own procedures and use of materials, and their views might be weighted according to their degree of skill in developing student achievement. But we must stress here that the importance of student and teacher judgments and hence the weight to be given them remains to be determined. At this stage we collect their observations for later, separate, analysis.

4. Posttesting* statistical analysis of relative importance of different profiles and of student and teacher judgments. Final testing would determine the level of achievement attained in the several skills by students in introductory classes and the improvement shown by students in intermediate classes. Degree of achievement can then be used to evaluate the profiles and subprofiles that characterize the classes in each setting. Several statistical procedures are now available for evaluating the relative importance of different patterns of training procedures, e.g. the "randomized block design"[4] and the use of "regression analysis."[5] By these means we can hope to isolate profiles and subprofiles within and among settings that were especially effective in developing proficiency, as well as profiles that showed little promise or none at all. The resulting rating or profiles will have been enhanced by the design provision for initial measurements of levels of potential (and achievement for intermediate students), for we can now not only relate final achievement scores to potential, but can determine the relative effectiveness of different profiles and subprofiles for students with different potentials. Further, the importance of the individual

---

4. B. J. Winer, Statistical Principles in Experimental Design, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

5. G. W. Snedecor, Statistical Methods, Ames, Iowa: The Iowa State University Press, 1956.

* See Table 1.

teacher's skill would show itself if, in the analysis, similar profiles and subprofiles among different classes seemed to accompany differences in achievement among students of matched potential. If this happens, subgroups of teachers could be isolated who are especially skilled at developing achievement and contrasts could be made with others who, using similar training approaches, were less successful. As previously indicated, similar analytical procedures will be used at this stage to evaluate the judgments of students and teachers collected in step 3.

Steps 5, 6 and 7 require no further discussion, other than to repeat our previous comment. If evaluation via step 6 proves to be as effective as the pretest-posttest sequence, it now becomes a streamlined procedure of great utility when used as the sole evaluative instrument. Steps 2 - 4 inclusive remain always available as protection against closing off language instruction from further investigation. They are invoked whenever newer insights and new research inspire variations in profiles deemed to have reasonable potential for modifying the observational criteria as used typically in step 5.

Step 1: Language Teaching Procedures and Principles and their Rated Importance

We were able to implement some of these ideas by drawing on the resources of the Center for Applied Linguistics and the 1965 NDEA Summer Institute for Teachers of Foreign Languages. In connection with the Center's work with the Defense Language Institute, a tentative list of relevant questions about language teaching and learning had been developed by Center staff and a team of consultants.* These questions were subsequently expanded and converted into 324 statements of procedures and principles that had been proposed as either valuable or essential for effective language teaching. These principles and policies were grouped under the following headings: 1) administration and policy; 2) teachers and teacher competence; 3) course design; 4) testing; 5) classroom and classes; and 6) language laboratory. While selected with the requirements of universities and government agencies in mind, most

*At different stages in the evolution of this material valuable contributions were made by Michèle Hendlisz, William Nemser, A. Hood Roberts, and Grace Yeni-Komshian, all on the staff of the Center for Applied Linguistics at the time. The authors are grateful to George Ferguson, Department of Psychology, McGill University, for statistical advice.

of them are clearly applicable to secondary school language instruction as well. A booklet containing these items and instructions for rating them was sent, along with an explanatory letter, to 621 members of the teaching staff of the 1965 NDEA Institutes, in all 50 States of the U.S. Teaching staff members were asked to rate the importance of each of the listed principles and procedures on a "value scale" from 1 (low) to 7 (high). A rating of -1 indicated that the responder felt the item was "bad" (i.e., to be avoided in good teaching). Completed booklets were returned by 364 people and their responses form the basis of this phase of our study. The items and instructions are given in an Appendix to this report.[6]

The responses were transferred to I.B.M. cards and the average ratings for each item were computed, along with the standard deviations of ratings. These statistics were computed without including values of (-1). In Table 2, we have listed those items that are Very Important (VI), Important (I), or Bad (B), according to the following definitions. If the mean (average) rating of an item is 6 or greater (out of a possible 7) and the standard deviation is less than one, the item is considered very important since nearly 70% of the judges rate that item as 5, 6 or 7. If an item has a mean rating of 6 or more and the standard deviation is greater than 1 but less than 2, the range of ratings is somewhat more diversified, although the item is still considered to be important. An item is considered bad if it is judged as involving a "wrong" or "bad" procedure by at least 12 per cent of the judges; and if the item has a mean rating of less than four (i.e., at the "unimportant" end of the rating scale).

Table 2 about here

From the biographical information supplied by each judge, we were able to compare the average ratings of various subgroups of judges, those, for example, with a good deal of experience teaching at the college or university level in contrast to those with less experience, or those with American training in contrast to those trained in Europe, etc. As is apparent in Table 2, our "selected" group of judges is remarkably like the "total" group which comprised all those involved in the NDEA institutes,

---

6. Single copies of the questionnaire booklet are obtainable at no charge from the Center for Applied Linguistics, to the limit of a very small supply.

including high school teachers and foreign trained instructors as well as American college and university teachers. Thus, the first noteworthy trend is the marked agreement as to what is important and what is not, or what is wrong or bad.

What is the nature of this agreement? If one examines Table 2 carefully, one notices that the language teaching movement in the U.S.A. has taken on a rather well-defined "new look," for better or for worse. To a possible charge of audio-lingual bias among these particular teachers one must immediately agree that there are surely many individuals with contrary views. But there can be no doubt that this is an influential group, whose impact is felt not only in their own institutions but in the many secondary schools whose teachers attended NDEA Institutes. Further, bias is hardly relevant to the ultimate purposes of the present project, for, you will recall, we simply wish to reduce our comprehensive inventory of features by some consistent means.

Let us outline briefly the content of this new look as it emerges from the strong consensus of a large group of influential language teachers.

First, with regard to administration, it is generally agreed that teachers should have the full support of supervisors who are themselves experienced in language pedagogy, and who will assure that enough teachers are available to permit them to prepare their lessons during the working day, and that opportunities are given teachers to shape courses according to their own ideas. Furthermore, salaries should be satisfactory, and teachers should have opportunities to improve their skills as well as expect advancements if they teach well. It is recommended that class size be held to approximately 18 students for regular courses, and 12 students for intensive courses.

The teachers themselves should have native or native-like competence in speaking, reading and writing the language they teach. They should also be competent in language pedagogy. As persons, they should be patient, agreeable, conscientious, firm but encouraging, show tact when correcting students, make clear exactly what is being corrected and assuring that the errors are actually corrected by the students. They should also be resourceful and flexible and be able to maintain interest.

With regard to course design, it is agreed that teachers should introduce new content gradually and in terms of already familiar materials. Many of our judges agreed, however, that they should not ask for memorization of vocabulary lists (45%)[7] or of grammatical rules (26%), nor should they introduce phonological elements as isolated sounds (21%) or ask students to make phonological transcriptions (21%). Instead, vocabulary should be introduced in appropriate situational contexts, through sentences. Our informants also agree that teachers should not concentrate exclusively on one aspect of instruction, such as grammar (39%), during a given class, nor should they use classtime for written exercises too early in the course (24%). In fact, there is agreement that they should completely hold off the introduction of standard orthography (34%). Consideration should be given to prosodic features of the language, such as intonation, but teachers should not use tongue-twisters (18%) or exaggerated stress in teaching pronunciation (34%), nor should sentences be used in which sounds occur with abnormally high frequency, as in repetitive alliteration (12%). Instead full use should be made of oral drills of various types, including conversations, substitutions, cued-responses, question-answer exercises and oral fluency drills. In fact, it is recommended that over three times as much attention be given to oral as compared to written work at the elementary level. At the advanced levels, this is reduced to a 5 to 4 ratio.

While oral exercises evoke strong positive agreement among our judges, translation exercises tend to be rated negatively (from 12% to 42%), whether they are oral or written, native language to foreign language or the converse, or sentences in one language used to elicit the other language equivalents. Further, given our definition of a "B" rating, there is some agreement that one should not use printed literal translations of readings (43%), nor should translations be used as prompting devices (46%) or glosses (13%), or as introductions (25%) or summaries (15%) of dialogues or text materials.

The use of analytic or descriptive statements are also considered as bad or unimportant by many teachers when used either before (17%) or during (35%) drills.

---

7. These and subsequent percentages refer to the proportion of teachers who rate the pertinent item as (-1). Each item, together with its rating, may be found in the Appendix.

Audio-visual aids are considered important as is the choice of the appropriate content of readings, considering the student's maturity. On the other hand, the use of free compositions at the elementary level is considered bad by 51% of our respondents.

Instruction about the foreign culture should make use of authentic information, presented preferably through films, and in such a fashion that it is coordinated into a unified program of study. At the advanced stages, the foreign language, not the native, should be used to present cultural information.

There is a very clear position on testing that comes to light when one examines what is considered bad and unimportant. The general view appears to be that few restrictions should be made with regard to who should or should not be admitted to a foreign language program.[8] Admittance on the basis of mimicry ability (16%) or native-language proficiency (31%), is viewed as wrong or unimportant, and, in fact, no item regarding admittance by aptitude test is regarded as "important." Furthermore, ability grouping according to vocabulary (16%), or writing proficiency (16%), is discouraged. With regard to periodic examinations, there is a negative attitude on the part of 15 to 26% of our respondents toward weekly or bi-monthly administration of vocabulary, grammar, or composition-writing tests, or mid-term exams that cover all materials touched on in the course. Instead, very strong support is given to tests for listening and speaking skills; students' achievement should be evaluated in terms of such tests, class performance and final exams, not on any of these components alone.

Various features of the classroom are rated as important. There should, for example, be good acoustics, low noise level, appropriate size and adequate lighting and ventilation.

---

8. As mentioned, the responses of various other subgroups were also compiled. It is interesting to note that there is extremely high agreement among groups (e.g. items rated VI by one group are generally rated VI by another group). One minor deviation from this general pattern may be noted in the responses of teachers who have received European university training. These judges rate items 178, 179, 180, 183, 185 relating to textual material or culture as VI or I. Further, they tend <u>not</u> to regard the items in Section IV (Testing) related to Admittance to Foreign Language Program, Grouping, Tests Administered During Foreign Language Course, as being bad items, while the other judges for whom data are reported do regard some of these as <u>bad</u> or unimportant features.

The language laboratory emerges as a very important characteristic of the new look in language training, and various features of language laboratories help one to infer what the good or ideal laboratory should be. First, laboratory work should be compulsory; it should be supervised, and coordinated with classroom activities. For regular courses, it is recommended that approximately 2 1/2 hours weekly be spent in the lab for every 5 hours in the class, at least for the first two semesters of training. For the third and fourth semesters, 2 hours of lab for every 3 hours of classtime is recommended. The lab periods should cover about 30 minutes. The laboratory should provide for preventive maintenance, emergency service facilities, tape cataloguing and distribution, as well as protection against vandalism and theft. With regard to the lab's physical facilities, there should be acoustic treatment of walls, ceilings, and booths. The equipment should be easy to operate, reliable and of good sound quality. "Professional" equipment for making master tapes should be available. The lab should have a director who is technically competent, but with technicians to help him.

Simple loudspeakers and headphones are judged to be insufficient by approximately 15% of the respondents. Instead, there should be headphones and microphones to permit students to hear themselves (audio-active system) while enabling teachers, from a central location, to listen to and communicate with individual students or with everyone in the lab. Recording with a tape speed of 1 7/8 inches per second is considered bad by 20% of our respondents. The taped material itself should be natural, making use of experienced performers and native speakers as models. There should be a variety of native voices used, both male and female; using different models in dialogue materials is important. Finally, taped drill exercises are valued, especially those which provide measured pauses during which the student responds.

In summary, then, judging from the very strong consensus arrived at by a large sample of influential teachers in North America, the new look in foreign language training is strongly biased toward a thoroughly audio-lingual approach with various sorts of modern supportive features.

In sum, a large group of influential language teachers seems to agree on what the features of the new look are or should be. Although these trends, which have appeared as a by-product of the first phase of our project, should be of interest to all those in the profession and of concern to those who like to keep experimentation with

varying procedures alive, we view them as part of a necessary stock-taking, providing us with the material to be used in the next phase where all aspects (positive as well as negative) of this new look will be used as guidelines for visiting evaluators and for students and teachers involved in the training itself. Whether these apparently important and unimportant principles and procedures are actually important or not now needs to be tested.

Table 2

Important and Unimportant Features of Language Teaching Principles and Procedures

Item No.	Judgment Group* Total	Selected	Item Content
			I. Principles of Administration and Policy
1.	VI	VI	A clear assignment of responsibility within the organization.
2.	I	I	Adequate number of personnel assigned to each activity or project (writing materials, teacher training, test monitoring, etc.).
3.	I	I	Supervisors or department heads competent in language pedagogy.
7.	I	I	An administrative mechanism allowing teachers to influence the preparation or adoption of materials.
11.	I	I	Limitation of the non-teaching work load to allow sufficient time for lesson preparation during the work day.
			Teacher Improvement and Status
12.	VI	VI	Opportunity for the teacher to improve his professional competence.
18.	VI	I	Opportunity for advancement in salary and rank as a result of outstanding teaching service.
19.	VI	VI	Salary levels designed to attract and keep qualified personnel.

*The total group comprises all 364 judges. The selected group comprises 130-140 highly experienced, American trained professors, excluding those with foreign degrees, those with 4 years or less teaching experience, and those who are teachers or administrators at the high school level.

The ratings are marked as Very Important (VI) if the mean rating is 6 or greater (out of possible 7), and with a standard deviation of less than 1, (thus approximately 70% of the judges rated that item 5 or greater); I indicates a mean rating of 6 or more with standard deviation of less than 2; B indicates Bad in that 12 percent of judges or more rated this item as "bad" or "wrong" (-1 rating) and the mean rating for the item is less than 4.

Item No.	Judgment Group* Total	Selected	Item Content
			II. Principles Related to Teachers and Teacher Competence
20.	VI	VI	Teachers with native or near-native competence in speaking the foreign language.
21.	I	I	Teachers with native or near-native competence in reading the foreign language.
22.	I	I	Teachers with native or near-native competence in writing the foreign language.
29.	I	I	Teachers competent in language pedagogy.
32.	I	VI	Patience of the teacher.
33.	I	I	Agreeable manner.
35.	VI	VI	Conscientiousness of the teacher in lesson preparation.
36.	I	I	Maintenance of control of the class at all times.
37.	VI	VI	Encouragement of students by the teacher.
38.	I	VI	Tact during correction.
39.	I	I	Prevention of ridicule of students by each other.
40.	I	VI	Rapport with the students.
44.	I	I	Unambiguous reference to error being corrected.
45.	I	I	Requiring accurate repetition by the student after the correction of his error.
53.	I	I	Resourcefulness: the use of unplanned opportunities to illustrate points mentioned.
54.		I	Varied demands made on students to compensate for differences in their relative proficiency.
55.	VI	VI	Maintenance of interest among the students.
			III. Course Design
56.	I	I	Introduction of new material in terms of already familiar material.

Item No.	Judgment Group* Total	Selected	Item Content
			III. Course Design (Cont'd)
57.	I	I	Gradual introduction of new material.
63.	B	B	Memorization of vocabulary lists.
66.	B	B	Memorization of grammatical rules.
70.	B	B	Introduction of phonological elements as isolated sounds.
74.	B	B	Use of phonological transcription by the student.
77.	I	I	Appropriateness of vocabulary to the situations in which it will be used.
80.	I	I	Introduction of vocabulary in situational context.
81.	I	I	Introduction of vocabulary in sentences.
90.	B	B	Concentration on one aspect of the language (pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar) during a given class hour.
91.	B	B	Immediate introduction of standard orthography.
95.	B	B	Use of classtime for written exercises at elementary stages of instruction.
97.	I	I	Consideration given prosodic features, e.g. intonation.
100.	B	B	Use of tongue-twisters in teaching pronunciation.
101.	B	B	Use of sentences in which the sounds occur with abnormally high frequency (e.g. Let's leave little Lily alone.)
102.	B	B	Use of devices such as unnatural stress and word division while drawing the student's attention to specific features or making corrections.
103.	VI	VI	Use of oral drills.
104.	I	VI	Use of oral conversion exercises (e.g. from negation to affirmation).
105.	I	I	Use of oral substitution exercises (e.g. There is no money - there is no bread.)

Item No.	Judgment Group* Total	Selected	Item Content
			III. Course Design (Cont'd)
106.	I	I	Use of oral cued response exercises (the teacher supplies part of the response).
107.	VI	VI	Use of oral question-answer exercises in the foreign language.
108.	I	I	Use of oral fluency drills (e.g. John is running, John is running to the store, John is running to the corner store.).
109.	B - R** B-Int**	B - R B-Int.	Use of oral native-language to foreign-language translation exercises. (E)*
110.	B - R** B-Int**	B - R B-Int.	Use of written native-language to foreign-language translation.
111.	B - R**	B - R	Use of oral native-language to foreign-language translation exercises. (A)*
112.	B - R** B-Int**	B - R B-Int.	Use of written native-language to foreign-language translation exercises. (A)*
113.	B - R** B-Int**	B - R B-Int.	Use of oral foreign-language to native-language translation exercises. (E)*
114.	B - R** B-Int**	B - R B-Int.	Use of written foreign-language to native-language translation exercises. (E)*
115.	B - R** B-Int**	B - R B-Int.	Use of oral foreign-language to native-language translation exercises. (A)
116.	B - R** B-Int**	B - R B-Int.	Use of written foreign-language to native-language translation exercises. (A)

*(E) means "at elementary stages of instruction," (A) means "at advanced stages of instruction."

**An intensive course is arbitrarily defined as one requiring 20 or more hours of student learning-time per week, including laboratory work, for a total of 200-800 hours.

A regular course is arbitrarily defined as a college or university course requiring five hours per week of class time for two semesters, three hours of class time for the third and fourth semester.

Item No.	Judgment Group* Total	Selected		Item Content
			III.	Course Design (Cont'd)
118.	B - R** B-Int**	B - R B-Int.		Use of written exercises allowing for latitude in response. (E)
129.	B	B		Use of native-language sentences to elicit foreign-language equivalents.
130.	B	B		Use of foreign-language sentences to elicit native-language equivalents.
135.	B	B		Use of analytic or descriptive statements before drill.
137.	B	B		Use of analytic or descriptive statements during drill.
139.		I		Use of audio-visual aids.
148.	I	I		Relationship of subject matter of readings to student maturity.
152.	B	B		Instructing the student to interpret one sentence at a time.
160.	VB	VB		Use of free composition at elementary stages.
168.	B	B		Use of printed native-language equivalents of dialogues or basic sentence materials preceding the foreign-language text.
170.	B	B		Use of printed native-language summaries of dialogues.
172.	B	B		Use of printed translations of readings.
173.	B	B		Use of printed literal translations.
174.	B	B		Use of printed interlinear translations.
175.	B	B		Use of printed interlinear translations as a prompting device.
176.	B	B		Use of marginal glosses in the native-language.
				Culture
184.	VI	VI		Presentation of authentic cultural information.

Item No.	Judgment Group* Total	Selected		Item Content
			III.	Course Design (Cont'd)
187.	B	B		Use of native-language in presenting cultural information at advanced stages of instruction.
189.	VI	VI		Use of foreign-language in presenting cultural information at advanced stages of instruction.
190.		I		Use of films in presenting cultural information.
194.	I	I		Coordination of these presentations into an integrated program.
			IV.	Testing
				Admittance to the Foreign Language Program
197.	B - R** B-Int**	B - R		Admittance on the basis of an interview testing the capacity of the student to mimic foreign sounds.
198.	B - R** B-Int**	B - R B-Int.		Admittance on the basis of an English proficiency test.
199.	B - R**			Admittance on the basis of an aptitude test designed by the foreign language teacher.
				Grouping
203.		B - R B-Int.		Ability grouping on the basis of a proficiency test in grammar.
204.	B - R** B-Int**	B - R B-Int.		Ability grouping on the basis of a proficiency test in vocabulary.
205.	B - R** B-Int**	B - R B-Int.		Ability grouping on the basis of a proficiency test in composition writing.
				Tests Administered During Foreign Language Course
208.	B - R** B-Int**	B - R B-Int.		Weekly administration of vocabulary tests.
209.	B - R** B-Int**	B - R B-Int.		Weekly administration of grammar tests.
210.	B - R** B-Int**	B - R B-Int.		Weekly administration of composition-writing tests.

Item No.	Judgment Group* Total	Selected	Item Content
			IV. Testing (Cont'd)
213.	B - R** B-Int**	B - R B-Int.	Bi-monthly administration of vocabulary tests.
214.	B - R** B-Int**	B - R B-Int.	Bi-monthly administration of grammar tests.
216.		B - R B-Int.	One mid-term exam on all the covered material.
219.	I	I	Importance of Speaking skill for testing purposes, regular courses.
	VI	VI	Importance of Listening skill for testing purposes, regular courses.
	VI	VI	Importance of Speaking skill for testing purposes, intensive courses.
	VI	VI	Importance of Listening skill for testing purposes, intensive courses.
			Evaluation of Student Achievement
223.	B	B	Evaluation based on tests only.
224.	B	B	Evaluation based on class performance only.
225.	B	B	Evaluation based on final exams only.
227.	B	B	Evaluation based on tests and final exams only.
228.	B	B	Evaluation based on class performance and final exams only.
229.	VI	VI	Evaluation based on tests, class performance, and final exams.
			V. Classroom and Classes
231.	I	I	Adequacy of the acoustics.
232.	I	I	Low noise level.
233.		I	Adequacy of the lighting.
234.	I	I	Comfortable temperature.

Item No.	Judgment Groups* Total	Selected	Item Content
			V. Classroom and Classes (Cont'd)
236.	I	I	Adequacy of the ventilation.
237.	I	I	Adequacy of the classroom size.
239.	I	VI	Presence of a blackboard.
			VI. Language Laboratory
			Administration and Policy
243.	I	I	Compulsory work in the laboratory.
247.		I	Supervision of students.
248.	VI	VI	Coordination of classroom and laboratory work.
253.	I	VI	Preventive maintenance program (e.g. periodic equipment inspections, equipment performance tests, etc.).
254.	I	VI	Emergency service facilities.
255.	I	I	Measures to prevent vandalism or theft.
256.	VI	VI	Tape cataloguing and distribution system.
			Physical Facilities, General
259.	I	I	Protection from distraction.
260.	I	I	Acoustic treatment of walls.
261.	I	I	Acoustic treatment of ceiling.
262.	I	VI	Acoustic treatment of booths.
264.	VI	VI	Ease of operation of equipment.
265.	VI	VI	Reliability of equipment.
266.	VI	VI	Sound quality.
267.	I	I	"Professional" recording equipment for making master tapes.
270.	I	I	Spare parts (e.g. tubes, microphone and headphone cords and plugs, etc.)

Item No.	Judgment Groups* Total	Selected	Item Content
			VI. Language Laboratory (Cont'd)
271.	VI	VI	Tape storage space.
			Staff
272.	I	I	A laboratory director.
273.	I	I	A director competent in technical aspects of equipment.
277.	I		Technician(s) responsible for daily maintenance.
			Laboratory Systems and Features
283.	B	B	General listening via loudspeaker.
284.	B	B	Headphones, without features in items 285 and 286.
285.		I	Headphones plus microphone to enable the student to hear himself as he responds (audio-active system).
293.	I	I	Teacher can listen to individual students from a central location (monitoring facilities).
295.	I	I	Teacher at central location can communicate with each student individually (intercom facilities).
298.	I	I	Teacher can address every one in the laboratory (all-call feature).
303.	B	B	Tape speed of 1 7/8 inches per second.
			Taped Material
307.	VI	VI	Naturalness.
308.	I	I	Experienced performers as models.
310.	VI	VI	Use of native-speakers as models on tape.
313.	VI	VI	Use of a variety of native voices.
314.	VI	VI	Use of male and female voices.

Item No.	Judgment Group* Total	Selected	Item Content
			VI. Language Laboratory (Cont'd)
317.	VI	VI	Use of different speakers for different roles in dialogue.
320.	I	I	Use of taped drills exercises.
321.	VI	VI	Use of measured pauses during which the student responds.

The following items are considered separately since they required judges to supply numerical information in addition to using the familiar rating scale.[1]

Item No.

159. Recommend ratios of oral to written work for intensive and for regular courses, and rate the importance of the recommended ratios according to the value scale.

a) at elementary stages

regular (%) 69.15 (70.26) oral work to (%) 20.67 (19.16) written work[2]

Importance = VI (VI)

intensive (%) 70.22 (72.67) oral work to (%) 18.57 (16.79) written work

Importance = VI (VI)

b) at advanced stages

regular (%) 51.57 (51.11) oral work to (%) 38.24 (37.37) written work

Importance = 5.87 (5.89)

intensive (%) 54.86 (55.19) oral work to (%) 33.32 (33.37) written work

Importance = 5.91 (5.96)

---

[1]The ratings of the total group are provided in the spaces below. Figures in parentheses are ratings of the selected group.

[2]These percentages should be treated as proportions. They do not total 100 since some judges did not answer both parts of an item.

Item No.

240. Recommend an optimum number of students per class for regular and intensive courses and rate the importance of your recommendation according to the value scale. Consider that classes should be limited to 5, 10, 15 or 30 students.

a) regular : (No.) 18 (18) students

Importance = I (VI)

b) intensive: (No.) 12 (12) students

Importance = VI (VI)

251. Recommend ratios of laboratory time to class time for "regular" and for "intensive" courses and rate the importance of the recommended ratios according to the value scale.

Regular, 1st and 2nd sem. (No.) 2.58 (2.62) hour(s) lab weekly to five hours class weekly.

Importance = 5.98 (I)

Regular, 3rd and 4th sem. (No.) 1.90 (1.95) hour(s) lab weekly to three hours class weekly.

Importance = 5.79 (5.89)

Intensive (No.) 1.61 (1.54) hour(s) lab weekly to (No.) 2.69 (2.55) hour(s) class weekly.

Importance = I (VI)

252. Recommend an optimum length for language laboratory periods (e.g. 30 minutes, 120 minutes) for students of university age or older, and rate the importance of the recommendation according to the value scale.

Single sittings of (No.) 30.77 (30.76) minutes.

Importance - VI (VI)

Sittings of (No.) 30.80 (34.12) minutes with (No.) 1.47 (1.59) breaks of (No.) 5.04 (4.45) minutes.

Importance = 5.72 (5.76)

Item No.

280. If your rating of item 279 is 3 or higher, recommend a ratio of such monitors to students working in the laboratory, and rate the importance of the recommended ratio according to the value scale.

There should be 1 monitor to (No.) 19 (16.03) students.

Importance = 5.41 (5.35)

282. If your rating of item 281 is 3 or higher, recommend a ratio of such monitors to students working in the laboratory, and rate the importance of the recommended ratio according to the value scale.

There should be 1 monitor to (No.) 16 (10.04) students.

Importance = 5.40 (5.31)

Appendix*

Rating Instructions for the Language Program Evaluation Project

Language teaching principles and procedures are grouped into six subsections:

I. Administration and Policy

II. Teachers and Teacher Competence

III. Course Design

IV. Testing

V. Classroom and Classes

VI. Language Laboratory

You are asked to rate the importance of each principle or procedure on a value scale:

/ / / / / / / / /
-1 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Seven (7) is the highest rating and means "very important"; one (1) is the lowest rating and means "unimportant." Rate each item by putting a mark (x) in the appropriate slot. The rating minus-one (-1) has a different meaning: it indicates that you consider that principle or procedure as bad or wrong. Sometimes the -1 slot is omitted. Occasionally you are asked to do something different; in such cases, special instructions are given. Make your rating on the basis of what you feel would be your opinion as a general rule, and do not worry about special cases or particular conditions unless they are specified in the item. Since the items are often in context, it will be helpful to read each subsection all the way through before deciding on your rating. If you feel that the meaning of an item is not clear, please so indicate in the margin.

Quite often you are asked to rate the importance of an item for "intensive" and "regular" courses separately. An intensive course is arbitrarily defined as one requiring 20 or more hours of student learning-time per week, including laboratory work, for a total of 200-600 hours. A regular course is arbitrarily defined as a college or university course requiring five hours per week of class time for two semesters, three hours of class time for the third and fourth semester. For intensive courses, assume a primary listening-speaking objective; for regular courses, assume a four-skill objective. Secondary schools are not included in this phase of the project.

---

*The mean rating, standard deviation, and % of (-1) responses are indicated for each item. Some items required numerical values (e.g., number of hours). These values may be found in Table 2.

Brief biographical questions appear at the end of the questionnaire. You may sign this or not, as you wish, but please do so if you would like to receive information concerning the progress of this project. A sheet is attached on which you may make additional comments.

I. PRINCIPLES OF ADMINISTRATION AND POLICY

TOTAL $\bar{X}$	TOTAL σ	SAMPLE %(-1)		
6.47	.89	0	1.	A clear assignment of responsibility within the organization.
6.11	1.15	0	2.	Adequate number of personnel assigned to each activity or project (writing materials, teacher training, test monitoring, etc.).
6.25	1.16	0	3.	Supervisors or department heads competent in language pedagogy.
4.96	1.63	.01	4.	Supervisors or department heads competent in linguistics.
R5.14 I4.5	1.55 1.88	.01 .02	5.	Supervisors or department heads competent in literature.
R5.95 I5.56	1.28 1.78	.02 .05	6.	Freedom of the teacher to supplement regular material with additional material of his own in his classes.
6.16	1.18	.01	7.	An administrative mechanism allowing teachers to influence the preparation or adoption of materials.
5.63	1.53	.01	8.	An administrative mechanism allowing students to transfer to different ability groups.
			9.	Number of teaching hours in intensive courses not to exceed _____. Rate the importance of this recommendation according to the value scale.
			10.	Number of teaching hours in regular courses not to exceed _____. Rate the importance of this recommendation according to the value scale.
6.17	1.17	0	11.	Limitation of the non-teaching work load to allow sufficient time for lesson preparation during the work day.
				TEACHER IMPROVEMENT AND STATUS
6.56	.83	0	12.	Opportunity for the teacher to improve his professional competence.
5.45	1.53	.02	13.	An in-service teacher training program.
4.55	1.75	.05	14.	Staff members visiting each other's classes.

Principles of Administration and Policy (Cont'd)

TOTAL $\bar{X}$	TOTAL σ	SAMPLE %(-1)		
5.16	1.60	.01	15.	Development of the teacher's competence in areas of specialization (writing of materials, teacher training, administration).
5.8	1.4	.01	16.	Opportunity for the teacher to attend professional meetings.
5.88	1.25	0	17.	Opportunity for the teacher to confer with specialists from other institutions.
6.41	1.00	.01	18.	Opportunity for advancement in salary and rank as a result of outstanding teaching service.
6.66	.77	0	19.	Salary levels designed to attract and keep qualified personnel.
			II.	PRINCIPLES RELATED TO TEACHERS AND TEACHER COMPETENCE
6.47	.88	0	20.	Teachers with native or near-native competence in speaking the foreign language.
6.37	1.05	.01	21.	Teachers with native or near-native competence in reading the foreign language.
6.06	1.16	.01	22.	Teachers with native or near-native competence in writing the foreign language.
5.22	1.64	.01	23.	Teachers with native or near-native competence in speaking the student's native language.
5.33	1.57	0	24.	Teachers with native or near-native competence in reading the student's native language.
4.99	1.67	.01	25.	Teachers with native or near-native competence in writing the student's native language.
4.85	1.7	.03	26.	Teachers trained in general pedagogy.
5.52	1.38	.01	27.	Teachers competent in the linguistics of the foreign language.
4.98	1.62	.01	28.	Teachers competent in the linguistics of the student's native language.
6.03	1.38	0	29.	Teachers competent in language pedagogy.

Principles Related to Teachers and Teacher Competence (Cont'd)

TOTAL $\bar{X}$	TOTAL σ	SAMPLE %(-1)		
5.02	1.57	.01	30.	Teachers competent in linguistics.
R5.38 I4.73	1.34 1.74	0 .01	31.	Teachers competent in literature.
6.24	1.12	0	32.	Patience of the teacher.
6.1	1.23	.01	33.	Agreeable manner.
5.37	1.55	.01	34.	Absence of distracting mannerisms.
6.5	.93	0	35.	Conscientiousness of the teacher in lesson preparation.
6.41	1.02	0	36.	Maintenance of control of the class at all times.
6.45	.96	0	37.	Encouragement of students by the teacher.
6.23	1.16	0	38.	Tact during correction.
6.27	1.19	.01	39.	Prevention of ridicule of students by each other.
6.33	1.07	0	40.	Rapport with the students.
5.57	1.37	0	41.	Availability of the teacher for conferences outside the class.
5.55	1.31	.01	42.	Stylistic appropriateness of the teacher's utterances (avoidance of over-precise, over-deliberate delivery).
5.25	1.42	0	43.	Insistence on stylistically appropriate utterances from the students.
6.18	1.11	.01	44.	Unambiguous reference to error being corrected.
6.23	1.12	0	45.	Requiring accurate repetition by the student after the correction of his error.
5.1	1.65	.01	46.	Requiring repetition of corrected sentences from students other than the one who has made the error.
4.59	1.89	.18	47.	Attention drawn to all student errors.
5.61	1.40	.03	48.	Selection of errors for correction on the basis of relevance to the day's lesson material.

Principles Related to Teachers and Teacher Competence (Cont'd)

TOTAL $\bar{X}$	TOTAL σ	SAMPLE %(-1)		
5.75	1.36	.01	49.	Selection of errors for correction on the basis of their importance in the over-all functioning of the language (e.g. their semantic, social and formal significance).
4.71	1.54	.02	50.	Adherence to basic lesson plan.
5.22	1.72	.05	51.	Order of recitation not predictable.
5.33	1.67	.04	52.	Allotment of equal attention to all students.
6.20	1.07	0	53.	Resourcefulness: The use of unplanned opportunities to illustrate points mentioned.
5.65	1.39	.01	54.	Varied demands made on students to compensate for differences in their relative proficiency.
6.49	.89	0	55.	Maintenance of interest among the students.
				III. COURSE DESIGN
6.1	1.14	0	56.	Introduction of new material in terms of already familiar material.
6.1	1.14	0	57.	Gradual introduction of new material.
5.5	1.52	.02	58.	Beginning class session with review of material covered in preceding session.
5.1	1.75	.01	59.	Ending class session with review of material covered during class session.
5.1	1.61	.02	60.	Memorization.
4.97	1.75	.03	61.	Memorization of dialogues.
5.53	1.58	.01	62.	Memorization of "basic sentences."
2.9	1.73	.45	63.	Memorization of vocabulary lists.
3.84	1.68	.04	64.	Memorization of poems.
3.48	1.62	.05	65.	Memorization of folklore materials (e.g. proverbs).
3.02	1.82	.26	66.	Memorization of grammatical rules.

Course Design (Cont'd)

TOTAL $\bar{X}$	TOTAL σ	SAMPLE %(-1)		
5.46	1.52	.01	67.	Planned introduction of phonological elements.
5.01	1.73	.02	68.	Treatment of phonological elements in a sequence related to order of occurrence in dialogue or basic sentence material.
5.32	1.51	.02	69.	Introduction of phonological elements through minimal pairs.
3.3	1.88	.21	70.	Introduction of phonological elements as isolated sounds.
4.84	1.79	.08	71.	Introduction of phonological elements by contrasting foreign language sounds with native language sounds.
5.14	1.65	.01	72.	The use of discrimination training techniques to teach phonological elements.
3.69	1.96	.09	73.	Use of phonological transcription by the teacher.
2.98	1.84	.21	74.	Use of phonological transcription by the student.
5.38	1.56	.03	75.	Coverage of all important features of the grammar appropriate to the class level.
5.35	1.71	.04	76.	Introduction of grammatical elements in a logical sequence.
6.2	1.1	0	77.	Appropriateness of vocabulary to the situations in which it will be used.
5.1	1.82	.03	78.	Introduction of vocabulary items in a logical sequence.
5.12	1.7	.01	79.	Order of introduction of vocabulary items based on frequency of occurrence.
6.1	1.21	0	80.	Introduction of vocabulary in situational context.
6.03	1.36	0	81.	Introduction of vocabulary in sentences.
5.93	1.31	.01	82.	Introduction of vocabulary in sentences which illustrate the meaning.
5.68	1.32	0	83.	Use of successive sentences in context.
5.10	1.47	.02	84.	Using non-language stimuli.

Course Design (Cont'd)

TOTAL $\bar{X}$	TOTAL σ	SAMPLE %(-1)		
5.17	1.48	.01	85.	Use of fictional situations to elicit utterances in the target language.
4.78	1.72	.03	86.	Use of pantomime to elicit utterances in the foreign language.
4.75	1.76	.05	87.	Use of pantomime to explain what something means.
5.59	1.44	.01	88.	Use of visual aids to elicit utterances in the foreign language.
5.48	1.59	.02	89.	Use of visual aids to explain what something means.
3.22	1.81	.39	90.	Concentration on one aspect of the language (pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar) during a given class hour.
3.55	2.12	.34	91.	Immediate introduction of standard orthography.
5.59	1.83	.07	92.	Delay of introduction of standard orthography until some proficiency is attained in the spoken language.
5.40	1.70	.04	93.	Presentation of the standard orthography in relation to the sound system.
5.49	1.54	.04	94.	Reading drills designed to elicit correct responses to foreign language orthography (e.g. English speakers may know that the German letter v represents an f sound, but still read it as if it were the English letter v.).
3.84	2.10	.24	95.	Use of classtime for written exercises at elementary stages of instruction.
4.46	1.83	.06	96.	Use of classtime for written exercises at advanced stages of instruction.
6.09	1.13	0	97.	Consideration given prosodic features, e.g. intonation.
5.60	1.69	.03	98.	Emphasis on conflicting native and foreign structures.
5.41	1.41	0	99.	Stylistic appropriateness of use of the foreign language.
3.19	1.70	.18	100.	Use of tongue-twisters in teaching pronunciation.
3.76	1.76	.12	101.	Use of sentences in which the sounds occur with abnormally high frequency (e.g. Let's leave little Lily alone.).

Course Design (Cont'd)

TOTAL $\bar{X}$	TOTAL σ	SAMPLE %(-1)		
3.31	1.79	.34	102.	Use of devices such as unnatural stress and word division while drawing the student's attention to specific features or making corrections.
6.53	.94	0	103.	Use of oral drills.
6.38	1.04	0	104.	Use of oral conversion exercises (e.g. from negation to affirmation).
6.35	1.03	0	105.	Use of oral substitution exercises (e.g. There is no money - there is no bread.).
6.04	1.35	.01	106.	Use of oral cued response exercises (the teacher supplies part of the response).
6.41	.88	0	107.	Use of oral question-answer exercises in the foreign language.
6.08	1.17	0	108.	Use of oral fluency drills (e.g. John is running, John is running to the store, John is running to the corner store.).
				In items 109 - 128, (E) means "at elementary stages of instruction," (A) means "at advanced stages of instruction."
R3.60 I3.85	1.89 2.05	.31 .31	109.	Use of oral native-language to foreign-language translation exercises. (E)
R3.18 I3.27	1.82 1.89	.35 .36	110.	Use of written native-language to foreign-language translation exercises. (E)
R3.99 I4.07	1.87 2.00	.16 .16	111.	Use of oral native-language to foreign-language translation exercises. (A)
R3.98 I3.91	1.91 1.94	.12 .13	112.	Use of written native-language to foreign-language translation exercises. (A)
R2.92 I3.05	1.77 1.81	.36 .36	113.	Use of oral foreign-language to native-language translation exercises. (E)
R2.80 I2.77	1.67 1.75	.42 .41	114.	Use of written foreign-language to native-language translation exercises. (E)

Course Design (Cont'd)

TOTAL $\bar{X}$	TOTAL σ	SAMPLE %(-1)		
R3.24 I3.36	1.92 1.96	.26 .27	115.	Use of oral foreign-language to native-language translation exercises. (A)
R3.66 I3.57	1.95 1.93	.26 .28	116.	Use of written foreign-language to native-language translation exercises. (A)
R4.40 I4.56	1.86 1.91	.13 .12	117.	Use of oral exercises allowing for latitude in response. (E)
R3.79 I3.94	1.89 1.92	.18 .19	118.	Use of written exercises allowing for latitude in response. (E)
R5.55 I5.74	1.47 1.44	.01 .01	119.	Use of oral exercises allowing for latitude in response. (A)
R5.19 I5.27	1.62 1.68	.01 .02	120.	Use of written exercises allowing for latitude in response. (A)
R4.93 I5.14	1.72 1.72	.03 .03	121.	Use of oral exercises eliciting specific patterns but offering free choice of vocabulary. (E)
R4.53 I4.57	1.74 1.82	.08 .07	122.	Use of written exercises eliciting specific patterns but offering free choice of vocabulary. (E)
R5.70 I5.88	1.40 1.35	.01 .01	123.	Use of oral exercises eliciting specific patterns but offering free choice of vocabulary. (A)
R5.39 I5.39	1.56 1.56	.01 .01	124.	Use of written exercises eliciting specific patterns but offering free choice of vocabulary. (A)
R4.60 I4.81	1.77 1.77	.06 .07	125.	Use of oral exercises in which the only demand is that the response fit the situational context. (E)
R4.06 I4.20	1.90 1.91	.11 .13	126.	Use of written exercises in which the only demand is that the response fit the situational context. (E)
R5.09 I5.26	1.78 1.73	.03 .04	127.	Use of oral exercises in which the only demand is that the response fit the situational context. (A)
R4.77 I4.85	1.88 1.86	.04 .06	128.	Use of written exercises in which the only demand is that the response fit the situational context. (A)

Course Design (Cont'd)

TOTAL $\bar{X}$	TOTAL σ	SAMPLE %(-1)		
3.68	1.91	.17	129.	Use of native-language sentences to elicit foreign-language equivalents.
3.25	1.81	.28	130.	Use of foreign-language sentences to elicit native-language equivalents.
4.33	2.00	.18	131.	Oral drills using rapid native-language sentences to elicit immediate foreign-language equivalents.
3.77	1.78	.09	132.	Analytic or descriptive statements about phonology.
3.60	1.67	.10	133.	Analytic or descriptive statements about vocabulary.
4.24	1.75	.03	134.	Analytic or descriptive statements about grammar.
3.69	1.91	.17	135.	Use of analytic or descriptive statements before drill.
4.60	1.77	.03	136.	Use of analytic or descriptive statements after drill.
3.12	1.84	.35	137.	Use of analytic or descriptive statements during drill.
4.92	1.66	.02	138.	Use of analytic or descriptive statements depending on complexity of pertinent aspect of language.
5.87	1.41	0	139.	Use of audio-visual aids.
5.06	1.77	.02	140.	Use of filmstrips as audio-visual aids.
5.08	1.73	.02	141.	Use of slides as audio-visual aids.
5.08	1.69	.02	142.	Use of films as audio-visual aids.
5.34	1.65	.02	143.	Use of drawings as audio-visual aids.
3.93	1.96	.04	144.	Use of models of the speech organs as audio-visual aids.
4.36	1.83	.03	145.	Use of props as audio-visual aids (e.g. model villages).
R5.19 I5.03	1.51 1.71	.02 .03	146.	Use of graded readers.
R4.39 I4.51	1.78 1.91	.06 .07	147.	Compulsory outside reading.
6.19	1.2	.01	148.	Relationship of subject matter of readings to student maturity.

Course Design (Cont'd)

TOTAL $\bar{X}$	TOTAL σ	SAMPLE %(-1)	
5.72	1.56	.02	149. Relationship of language of readings to student maturity.
5.21	1.59	.01	150. Readings distinguishing between formal and informal levels of usage.
			In rating the importance of items 151 - 158, disregard the relative emphasis placed on reading skills in any program.
5.65	1.42	.02	151. Instructing the student in reading techniques.
3.26	1.79	.22	152. Instructing the student to interpret one sentence at a time.
5.91	1.31	.02	153. Instructing the student to interpret more comprehensive units rather than one sentence at a time.
5.44	1.55	.02	154. Instructing the student in reading aloud.
4.90	1.90	.04	155. Instructing the student in reading silently.
4.49	2.02	.06	156. Instructing the student in the use of a bilingual dictionary.
5.47	1.77	.03	157. Instructing the student in the use of a monolingual dictionary.
5.81	1.42	.01	158. Instructing the student in other ways of handling unfamiliar vocabulary in reading.
			159. Recommend ratios of oral to written work for intensive and for regular courses, and rate the importance of the recommended ratios according to the value scale.
6.13	.99	0	a) at elementary stages
			regular (%) _____ oral work to (%) _____ written work
6.18	.93	0	intensive (%) _____ oral work to (%) _____ written work
			b) at advanced stages
5.87	1.02	0	regular (%) _____ oral work to (%) _____ written work
5.91	1.10	0	intensive (%) _____ oral work to (%) _____ written work

Course Design (Cont'd)

TOTAL $\bar{X}$	TOTAL σ	SAMPLE %(-1)	
			In rating items 160 - 166, disregard the relative emphasis placed on writing skill in any program.
2.92	1.89	.51	160. Use of free composition at elementary stages.
5.37	1.52	.01	161. Use of free composition at advanced stages.
5.59	1.51	.01	162. Controlled writing drills.
5.18	1.87	.12	163. Use of native-language model of good writing.
5.09	1.66	0	164. Use of dictation.
5.01	1.70	.06	165. Use of dictation to teach spelling.
5.06	1.66	.04	166. Use of dictation to fix phonological distinctions.
			TEXTUAL MATERIAL
			In items 167 - 177 assume that a stage has been reached when printed material is used in at least some phases of instruction.
4.74	1.84	.10	167. Use of printed native-language equivalents of dialogues or basic sentence materials.
3.87	2.04	.25	168. Use of printed native-language equivalents of dialogues or basic sentence materials preceding the foreign-language text.
4.13	1.99	.15	169. Use of printed native-language equivalents of dialogues or basic sentence materials following the foreign-language text.
3.98	2.00	.15	170. Use of printed native-language summaries of dialogues.
4.92	1.76	.08	171. Text of oral drills available to the student.
2.43	1.60	.43	172. Use of printed translations of readings.
2.26	1.43	.58	173. Use of printed literal translations.
2.32	1.52	.54	174. Use of printed interlinear translations.
2.46	1.54	.46	175. Use of printed interlinear translations as a prompting device.

Course Design (Cont'd)

TOTAL $\bar{X}$	TOTAL σ	SAMPLE %(-1)		
3.59	1.80	.13	176.	Use of marginal glosses in the native-language.
5.09	1.72	.02	177.	Use of marginal glosses in the foreign-language.
5.54	1.51	.01	178.	Use of pictures to illustrate situations.
5.34	1.73	.01	179.	Use of pictures to identify objects.
5.6	1.52	.01	180.	Use of pictures to elicit foreign-language sentences.
4.77	1.83	.06	181.	Use of pictures to illustrate grammatical features.
5.61	1.49	0	182.	Adequacy of the typography of the text.
5.61	1.54	0	183.	Indexing of materials.
				CULTURE
6.50	1.00	0	184.	Presentation of authentic cultural information.
5.93	1.38	.01	185.	Presentation of authentic cultural information as part of a regular language lesson.
4.39	1.86	.10	186.	Use of native-language in presenting cultural information at elementary stages of instruction.
3.02	2.23	.34	187.	Use of native-language in presenting cultural information at advanced stages of instruction.
3.90	1.92	.10	188.	Use of foreign-language in presenting cultural information at elementary stages of instruction.
6.47	..93	.01	189.	Use of foreign-language in presenting cultural information at advanced stages of instruction.
5.93	1.23	0	190.	Use of films in presenting cultural information.
4.78	1.76	0	191.	Use of lectures in presenting cultural information.
5.03	1.58	.01	192.	Assignment of special readings as sources of cultural information.
5.72	1.44	.01	193.	Arranging personal contact with native speakers.
6.07	1.31	0	194.	Coordination of these presentations into an integrated program.

IV. TESTING

ADMITTANCE TO THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE PROGRAM

TOTAL $\bar{X}$	TOTAL σ	SAMPLE %(-1)		
R4.49 I5.26	1.90 1.86	.13 .10	195.	Admittance to the foreign language program on the basis of a standardized language aptitude test.
R4.13 I4.73	1.78 1.86	.12 .11	196.	Admittance on the basis of auditory skills (e.g. discrimination).
R3.53 I3.94	1.78 1.84	.16 .15	197.	Admittance on the basis of an interview testing the capacity of the student to mimic foreign sounds.
R3.11 I3.29	1.85 1.99	.31 .31	198.	Admittance on the basis of an English proficiency test.
R3.97 I4.18	1.93 1.99	.20 .19	199.	Admittance on the basis of an aptitude test designed by the foreign language teacher.
				GROUPING: Placement of students on the basis of aptitude and/or proficiency tests.
R4.67 I5.13	1.63 1.69	.07 .07	200.	Ability grouping on the basis of a language aptitude test score.
R5.41 I5.69	1.41 1.37	.02 .02	201.	Ability grouping on the basis of a general proficiency test in the foreign language.
R3.70 I4.14	1.71 1.78	.07 .06	202.	Ability grouping on the basis of a proficiency test in pronunciation.
R3.51 I3.74	1.69 1.75	.10 .11	203.	Ability grouping on the basis of a proficiency test in grammar.
R3.21 I3.46	1.64 1.70	.16 .16	204.	Ability grouping on the basis of a proficiency test in vocabulary.
R3.38 I3.58	1.70 1.78	.16 .18	205.	Ability grouping on the basis of a proficiency test in composition writing.

TESTS ADMINISTERED DURING FOREIGN LANGUAGE COURSE

R4.54 I5.14	1.88 1.82	.05 .04	206.	Tests administered weekly on all the covered material.
R3.99 I4.40	1.86 1.91	.07 .06	207.	Weekly administration of pronunciation tests.

Testing (Cont'd)

TOTAL $\bar{X}$	TOTAL σ	SAMPLE %(-1)		
R3.36 I3.56	1.80 1.87	.19 .20	208.	Weekly administration of vocabulary tests.
R3.44 I3.71	1.77 1.84	.15 .17	209.	Weekly administration of grammar tests.
R3.26 I3.49	1.87 1.93	.14 .17	210.	Weekly administration of composition-writing tests.
R4.90 I4.91	1.77 1.84	.04 .04	211.	Bi-monthly administration of tests on all the covered material.
R3.95 I4.13	1.81 1.85	.09 .09	212.	Bi-monthly administration of pronunciation tests.
R3.45 I3.49	1.80 1.75	.19 .19	213.	Bi-monthly administration of vocabulary tests.
R3.74 I3.67	1.81 1.84	.13 .13	214.	Bi-monthly administration of grammar tests.
R3.76 I3.71	1.82 1.90	.09 .10	215.	Bi-monthly administration of composition-writing tests.
R4.87 I4.88	2.26 2.26	.20 .20	216.	One mid-term exam on all the covered material.
R4.83 I5.09	1.95 1.91	.07 .07	217.	Weekly tests in addition to mid-term tests.
R4.52 I4.49	1.91 1.93	.09 .10	218.	Bi-monthly tests in addition to mid-term tests.
a)6.11 b)6.38 c)4.97 d)5.49	1.17 .89 1.53 1.28	0 0 0 0	219. R	Rate on the value scale the importance of each skill for testing purposes. regular Speaking; Listening; Writing; Reading.
a)6.51 b)6.62 c)4.75 d)5.17	.78 .69 1.64 1.49	0 0 0 0	I	intensive Speaking; Listening; Writing; Reading.

Testing (Cont'd)

TESTS ADMINISTERED AT THE END OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE COURSE

TOTAL $\bar{X}$	TOTAL σ	SAMPLE %(-1)		
a)5.22	1.74	.06	220.	Final exams designed by the foreign language teacher for his own class.
b)4.50	1.79	.10		
c)4.73	1.80	.08		
d)4.51	1.75	.07		regular (a) on pronunciation; (b) on vocabulary;
e)5.57	1.66	.03		(c) on grammar; (d) on composition-writing;
f)5.28	1.72	.03		(e) general oral exams; (f) general written exams.
a)5.02	1.73	.09	221.	Final exams designed in cooperation with the administration to provide a standard test applicable to all classes.
b)4.53	1.70	.12		
c)4.71	1.71	.10		
d)4.44	1.76	.10		regular (a) on pronunciation; (b) on vocabulary;
e)5.41	1.68	.05		(c) on grammar; (d) on composition-writing;
f)5.29	1.64	.05		(e) general oral exams; (f) general written exams.
a)5.88	1.41	.03	222.	Use of standardized tests such as the MLA-Cooperative Foreign Language Tests on:
b)5.69	1.52	.03		
c)5.67	1.41	.02		
d)5.41	1.55	.03		regular (a) listening comprehension; (b) speaking;
				(c) reading; (d) writing.

EVALUATION OF STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

3.06	1.45	.39	223.	Evaluation based on tests only.
3.22	1.58	.35	224.	Evaluation based on class performance only.
2.82	1.61	.45	225.	Evaluation based on final exams only.
4.56	1.68	.20	226.	Evaluation based on tests and class performance only.
3.54	1.63	.31	227.	Evaluation based on tests and final exams only.
3.88	1.59	.25	228.	Evaluation based on class performance and final exams only.
6.74	.82	.01	229.	Evaluation based on tests, class performance, and final exams.

V. CLASSROOM AND CLASSES

4.99	1.96	.01	230.	Accessibility of the classroom.
6.20	1.22	0	231.	Adequacy of the acoustics.

Classroom and Classes (Cont'd)

TOTAL $\bar{X}$	TOTAL σ	SAMPLE %(-1)		
6.17	1.25	.01	232.	Low noise level.
5.89	1.33	0	233.	Adequacy of the lighting.
6.00	1.30	0	234.	Comfortable temperature.
5.61	1.62	.02	235.	Flexibility of the seating arrangements.
6.13	1.21	0	236.	Adequacy of the ventilation.
6.16	1.22	0	237.	Adequacy of the classroom size.
5.43	1.58	0	238.	Attractiveness of the general appearance.
6.45	1.01	0	239.	Presence of a blackboard.
			240.	Recommend an optimum number of students per class for regular and intensive courses and rate the importance of your recommendation according to the value scale. Consider that classes should be limited to 5, 10, 15 or 30 students.
3.54	1.12	0	R	
6.17	1.03	0		
2.35	.82	0	I	a) regular : (no.)_____ students
6.41	.87	0		b) intensive: (no.)_____ students
5.65	1.22	.01	241.	Homogeneity of the classes in language proficiency.
5.31	1.35	.01	242.	Homogeneity of the classes in aptitude.

VI. LANGUAGE LABORATORY

ADMINISTRATION AND POLICY

6.04	1.33	.03	243.	Compulsory work in the laboratory.
5.47	1.80	.02	244.	Keeping attendance records.
5.14	1.85	.06	245.	Attendance at times convenient to the student.
4.73	1.91	.06	246.	Attendance by classes.
5.95	1.40	.02	247.	Supervision of students.
6.71	.65	.01	248.	Coordination of classroom and laboratory work.

Language Laboratory (Cont'd)

TOTAL $\bar{X}$	TOTAL σ	SAMPLE %(-1)		
4.90	1.89	.06	249.	Counting laboratory work as homework.
5.74	1.39	.01	250.	Requiring other homework.
			251.	Recommend ratios of laboratory time to class time for "regular" and for "intensive" courses and rate the importance of the recommended ratios according to the value scale.
2.58 5.99	1.23 1.06	.01 0	R	Regular, 1st and 2nd sem. (No.)_____hour(s) lab weekly to five hours class weekly.
1.90 5.79	1.04 1.21	.01 0	R	Regular, 3rd and 4th sem. (No.)_____hour(s) lab weekly to three hours class weekly.
1.61 2.69 6.06	1.03 1.57 1.10	.01 .01 0	I	Intensive (No.)_____hour(s) lab weekly to (No.) _____ hour(s) class weekly.
			252.	Recommend an optimum length for language laboratory periods (e.g. 30 minutes, 120 minutes) for students of university age or older, and rate the importance of the recommendation according to the value scale.
6.14	.99	0		Single sittings of (No.)_____minutes
1.47 5.72	.86 1.34	0 0		Sittings of (No.)_____minutes with (No.)_____ breaks of (No.)_____ minutes.
6.36	1.10	.01	253.	Preventive maintenance program (e.g. periodic equipment inspections, equipment performance tests, etc.).
6.22	1.19	.01	254.	Emergency service facilities.
6.15	1.31	.01	255.	Measures to prevent vandalism or theft.
6.46	.98	.01	256.	Tape cataloguing and distribution system.
				PHYSICAL FACILITIES, GENERAL
5.45	1.53	.01	257.	Accessibility of building.
5.50	1.54	.01	258.	Accessibility of room.

Language Laboratory (Cont'd)

TOTAL $\bar{X}$	TOTAL σ	SAMPLE %(-1)		
6.14	1.20	.01	259.	Protection from distraction.
6.19	1.29	0	260.	Acoustic treatment of walls.
6.26	1.22	0	261.	Acoustic treatment of ceiling.
6.44	1.06	0	262.	Acoustic treatment of booths.
5.56	1.59	.01	263.	Acoustic treatment of floors.
6.50	.89	0	264.	Ease of operation of equipment.
6.73	.65	0	265.	Reliability of equipment.
6.65	.74	0	266.	Sound quality.
6.10	1.23	.01	267.	"Professional" recording equipment for making master tapes.
5.67	1.47	.01	268.	Recording studio.
5.90	1.34	0	269.	Fully equipped spare booths.
6.25	1.21	0	270.	Spare parts (e.g. tubes, microphone and headphone cords and plugs, etc.).
6.44	.97	0	271.	Tape storage space.
				STAFF
6.34	1.18	.01	272.	A laboratory director.
6.00	1.34	0	273.	A director competent in technical aspects of equipment.
5.74	1.45	.02	274.	A director competent in language pedagogy.
5.30	1.59	.02	275.	A director competent in materials design.
5.14	1.67	.02	276.	A director competent in design and administration of learning experiments.
6.03	1.27	0	277.	Technician(s) responsible for daily maintenance.
5.77	1.41	.01	278.	Technician(s) responsible for recording and editing tapes.
5.06	1.88	.03	279.	Monitor(s) (exclusive of teacher or supervisor, if any) whose sole duty is to help students with routine equipment or administrative problems.

Language Laboratory (Cont'd)

TOTAL $\bar{X}$	TOTAL σ	SAMPLE %(-1)		
3.82 5.41	1.58 1.31	.03 0	280.	If your rating of item 279 is 3 or higher, recommend a ratio of such monitors to students working in the laboratory, and rate the importance of the recommended ratio according to the value scale. There should be 1 monitor to (No.) _____ students.
4.36	2.03	.07	281.	Monitor(s) (exclusive of teacher or supervisor, if any) who also help(s) students with language problems.
3.30 5.40	1.55 1.41	0 0	282.	If your rating of item 281 is 3 or higher, recommend a ratio of such monitors to students working in the laboratory, and rate the importance of the recommended ratio according to the value scale. There should be 1 monitor to (No.) _____ students.
				LABORATORY SYSTEMS AND FEATURES
				(Disregard comparative costs in items 283-286.)
3.36	2.06	.17	283.	General listening via loudspeaker.
3.21	1.96	.15	284.	Headphones, without features in items 285 and 286 below.
5.93	1.40	.02	285.	Headphones plus microphone to enable the student to hear himself as he responds (audio-active system).
5.77	1.63	.01	286.	Student can record his voice and play back the recording (listen-record-compare system).
5.05	1.88	.05	287.	A minimum of equipment at student position.
5.03	1.82	.04	288.	A remote-controlled system.
4.94	1.83	.05	289.	A single master tape is played from a central location.
5.04	1.89	.04	290.	Each student has his own tape.
4.28	1.84	.06	291.	Students in the same class listen to the same material.
5.93	1.36	.01	292.	Provision for student learning at his own pace.
6.48	1.03	.01	293.	Teacher can listen to individual students from a central location (monitoring facilities).

Language Laboratory (Cont'd)

TOTAL $\bar{X}$	TOTAL σ	SAMPLE %(-1)		
4.77	1.96	.06	294.	Monitor can listen to student at student position.
6.31	1.25	.01	295.	Teacher at central location can communicate with each student individually (intercom facilities).
5.90	1.42	.02	296.	Teacher can set up various groups for separate listening.
5.74	1.58	.02	297.	Teacher can communicate with different groups.
6.31	1.34	.01	298.	Teacher can address every one in the laboratory (all-call feature).
5.00	1.74	.02	299.	Reel-to-reel manual tape threading.
4.10	1.93	.11	300.	Tape cartridge system.
4.28	1.90	.03	301.	Tape speed of 7 1/2 inches per second.
4.82	1.82	.03	302.	Tape speed of 3 3/4 inches per second.
2.60	1.69	.20	303.	Tape speed of 1 7/8 inches per second.
5.84	1.40	.01	304.	Facilities for individual speaking tests.
4.96	1.89	.06	305.	Facilities for group-speaking tests.
				TAPED MATERIAL
5.90	1.35	0	306.	Stylistic appropriateness.
6.39	.94	0	307.	Naturalness.
6.03	1.36	0	308.	Experienced performers as models.
5.75	1.48	.04	309.	Tapes distinguishing between language for listening and language for imitation.
6.63	.79	0	310.	Use of native-speakers as models on tape.
4.53	1.75	.13	311.	Use of near-native speakers as models on tape.
5.64	1.50	.03	312.	Use of speech of various tempos.
6.50	.90	0	313.	Use of a variety of native voices.
6.47	1.00	0	314.	Use of male and female voices.

Language Laboratory (Cont'd)

TOTAL $\bar{X}$	TOTAL σ	SAMPLE %(-1)		
5.13	1.70	.01	315.	Use of voices of speakers in different age categories.
5.86	1.26	0	316.	Use of recorded dialogues.
6.39	.99	0	317.	Use of different speakers for different roles in dialogue.
4.47	1.87	.03	318.	Inclusion of realistic sound effects.
4.98	1.68	.03	319.	Use of taped dialogues designed to allow participation of the student as one of the speakers.
6.26	1.11	0	320.	Use of taped drills exercises.
6.56	.85	.01	321.	Use of measured pauses during which the student responds.
4.92	1.68	.01	322.	Use of actual news broadcast and actual speeches.
5.54	1.48	.01	323.	Use of classroom lesson material as laboratory script.
5.79	1.36	.01	324.	Use of remedial tapes.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

TITLE AND NAME_____

AGE_____

PERMANENT POSITION_____

INSTITUTION_____

ADDRESS_____

UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE_____ IN (FIELD(S) OF CONCENTRATION) _____

HIGHEST GRADUATE DEGREE_____ IN (FIELD(S) OF CONCENTRATION) _____

YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE_____

LANGUAGE(S) TAUGHT_____